

REMARKS

Applicants request reconsideration of the restriction requirement and examination of all of the claims, as amended, on the merits in light of the foregoing amendments and the remarks which follow.

FOREIGN PRIORITY

Applicants thank the Examiner for acknowledging the claim for priority and receipt of a certified copy of the priority document.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

It is requested that the Examiner consider applicants' First Information Disclosure Statement filed October 20, 2006 and return a fully-initialed copy of applicants' Form PTO-1449 to the undersigned with the next official communication.

STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 17-32 remain in this application. Claims 1-16 were previously cancelled.

DISCUSSION OF CLAIM AMENDMENTS

Claim 29 has been amended in an effort to address the Examiner's issues with this claim. This claim is a dependent claim, not an independent claim, and is drawn to a method of using at least one robot as claimed in claim 1. This has been rewritten as a proper method of use claim. If the Examiner would prefer that Claim 29 be rewritten as an independent claim, applicants will be willing to amend it to be independent. As rewritten, the claim is believed to be neither indefinite under 112 second paragraph nor improper under 101.

ELECTION/RESTRICTION

The Examiner has required restriction between Group I, Claims 17-28, drawn to a print robot; and Group II, Claims 29-32, drawn to a printing process. Applicants hereby elect, with traverse, Group I, Claims 17-28, drawn to a print robot.

Nevertheless, the restriction requirement is traversed because the claims of both Groups I and II share the same special technical features, those of the Group I print robot. While Group II may have additional special technical features, such does not detract from the fact that it shares the special technical features of the Group I robot. Thus, all of the claims are linked to form a single general inventive concept as required by PCT Rule 13.1. Furthermore, PCT Rule 13.2 specifically allows claims to a product and to a method of using the product in a single application; such claims are considered to meet PCT unity of invention requirements. See M.P.E.P., Rev. 6, Sept. 2007, 1800-100 to 1800-101.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration and withdrawal of the restriction requirement and examination of all of the claims on the merits are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL & ROONEY PC

Date: August 20, 2009

By: Mary Katherine Baumeister
Mary Katherine Baumeister
Registration No. 26254

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, VA 22313-1404
703 836 6620